



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/600,390

06/20/2003

Avijit Chatterjee

ROC920030238US1

7557

46797

7590

02/04/2009

IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW  
DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1  
3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH  
ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER

HARPER, LEON JONATHAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2166

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/04/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/600,390	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CHATTERJEE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Leon J. Harper	<b>Art Unit</b> 2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9, 11-18, 25, 36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9, 11-18, 25, 36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The amendment filed 11/20/08 has been entered. Claims 9, 25 and 36 have been amended. No claims have been added or cancel. Accordingly, claims 9, 11-18, 25 and 36 are pending in this office action.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 9, 11-18, 25 and 36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 2166

Claims 9, 11-18 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6803927 (hereinafter Sahoo), in view of US5253362 (Nolan).

As for claim 9 Sahoo discloses:: a data store storing a plurality of data objects (See column 2 lines 30-40) a plurality of different applications editing the plurality of data objects, wherein each application performs a different type of editing and wherein a relationship is defined between each data object and a respective application for editing the respective data object(See column 2 lines 28-33); Sahoo however does not disclose an annotation store storing one or more annotations annotating the plurality of data objects edited by the plurality of different applications an annotation browser configured to access the annotation store and providing one or more graphical user interfaces for creating and viewing the one ore more annotation an annotation browser configured to display one or more annotations along with selectable links to at least one of the plurality of data objects annotated by each annotation; and wherein selecting any one of the selectable causes one of the plurality of different applications used to edit the recpective data object to be invoked. Nolan however does disclose an annotation store storing one or more annotations annotating the plurality of data objects edited by the plurality of different applications (See figure 10) an annotation browser configured to access the annotation store and providing one or more graphical user interfaces for creating and viewing the one ore more annotations (See column 5 lines 35-42).an annotation browser configured to display annotations and links to associated annotated data objects and wherein selecting

Art Unit: 2166

the links to the associated data objects causes an application used to manipulate the associated data objects to be invoked (See column 2 lines 50-60). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teaching of Nolan into the system of Sahoo. The modification would have been obvious because the two references are concerned with the solution to problem of browsing and storing annotations, therefore there is an implicit motivation to combine these references. In other words, the ordinary skilled artisan, during his/her quest for a solution to the cited problem, would look to the cited references at the time the invention was made. Consequently, the ordinary skilled artisan, would have been motivated to combine the cited references since Nolan's teaching would enable users of the Sahoo system to store annotations in scratch pad form.

As for claim 11 the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to display data and indications of what displayed data has one or more corresponding annotations (See column 5 lines 35-42).

As for claim 12 the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses wherein the annotation browser is configured to display one or more annotation icons proximate to an annotated data object (See figure 8).

Art Unit: 2166

As for claim 13, the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses: wherein: at least one common annotation describes more than one data object (See figure 6 and column 5 lines 51-55), and the annotation browser is configured to display a common annotation icon proximate to data objects described by the common annotation (See column 5 lines 60-65 notes the nurses notes hold annotations).

As for claim 14, the rejection of claim 13 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses wherein the annotation browser is configured to display different annotation icons proximate to data objects described by different annotations (See figure 5 and note that you are going to get a different view depending on what the annotation is).

As for claim 15, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to display a first annotation icon to indicate a displayed data object has a single annotation and a second annotation icon to indicate a displayed data object has multiple annotations (See column 5 line 60- column 6 line 4 and noting that icon is in a cell and will display differently depending on the annotation) .

As for claim 16, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to display a first portion

Art Unit: 2166

of annotation data from an annotation, in response to a user positioning a cursor over an associated annotation icon (See Figure 5 “showing details” ).

As for claim 17, the rejection of claim 16 is incorporated, and further Nolan disclose: wherein the annotation browser is further configured to, in response to the user selecting the annotation icon, display a second portion of annotation data from the annotation (See figure 6 “expanded annotations”).

As for claim 18, the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses wherein the annotation browser is further configured to, in response to the user selecting the annotation icon, retrieve the second portion of annotation data from the annotation store (See figure 6 and note that annotations are contained within the local data storage).

Claim 25 is a system claim substantially comprising the same limitations as claim 1 and is thus rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 36 is a system claim substantially comprising the same limitations as claim 1 and is thus rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

### **Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leon J. Harper whose telephone number is 571-272-0759. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM - 4:00Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

*LJH*

*Leon J. Harper*

*January 31, 2009*

/Hosain T Alam/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2166